



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/755,192	01/09/2004	Richard John Sachen JR.		5692

7590

09/18/2006

Richard J. Sachen  
1617 Madeira Circle  
Petaluma, CA 94954

EXAMINER

SHANKAR, VIJAY

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2629

DATE MAILED: 09/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/755,192	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SACHEN, RICHARD JOHN	
	<b>Examiner</b> VIJAY SHANKAR	<b>Art Unit</b> 2629	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                                                        |                                                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. Claims 1-4 are rejected as failing to define the invention in the manner required by 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The claim(s) are narrative in form and replete with indefinite and functional or operational language. The structure which goes to make up the device must be clearly and positively specified. The structure must be organized and correlated in such a manner as to present a complete operative device. **The claim(s) must be in one sentence form only.** Note the format of the claims in the patent(s) cited.

### ***Claim Objections***

2. Claim 2-4 is objected to because of the following informalities:
  - 1) Claim 2, line 3; period is missing in the end.
  - 2) Claims 2-4, line 1; insert "claim" before "1".

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kallergi et al (6,630,937) in view of Kamikaki et al (6,154,359).

Regarding Claim 1, Kallergi et al teaches a dual LCD monitor stand that consists of a mounting plate to support LCD monitors (Figs.1-2); a hinge connecting the mounting plate to the support arm allowing the mounting plate to be adjusted from the vertical; internal electronics to provide power, boost the signal, and/or switch input from one or more video sources into each or both displays (Figs.1-2; Column 4, line 3- Col.5, line 20); and a base to hold said electronics that also supports the structure without tipping (Figs.1-2; Column 4, line 3- Col.5, line 20).

However, Kallergi et al does not teach a monitor comprising a hinge connecting the mounting plate to the support arm allowing the mounting plate to be adjusted from the vertical; a compound hinge that allows the monitors to fold from side-by-side to back-to-back orientation in a small space; a turntable for allowing the compound hinge to rotate 360 degrees.

Kamikaki et al teaches a monitor comprising a hinge connecting the mounting plate to the support arm allowing the mounting plate to be adjusted from the vertical, a compound hinge that allows the monitors to fold from side-by-side to back-to-back orientation in a small space, a turntable for allowing the compound hinge to rotate 360 degrees. (Figs.7-8; Column 5, line 47- Col.6, line 67).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teaching of Kamikaki et al into Kallergi et al for providing the monitor to show side-by-side to back-to-back orientation to the users.

Regarding Claims 2-4, Kallergi et al teaches the dual LCD monitor stand with switch, splitter and amplification circuits removed allowing for two inputs to produce independent images on two monitors and second input removed allowing for one input to produce a duplicate image on two monitors, the internal electronics include a multi-function computing device. (Figs.1-2; Column 4, line 3- Col.5, line 20).

### ***Conclusion***

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ram, Rebeske, Davis, Vossler all teach the dual monitor.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VIJAY SHANKAR whose telephone number is (571) 272-7682. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00 am - 4:30 pm.

Art Unit: 2629

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, BIPIN SHALWALA can be reached on (571) 272-7681. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



VIJAY SHANKAR  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2629

VS